

## PROPOSED COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

For Calendar Year: 2005New X

Previous Year (below line/defer) \_\_\_\_\_

Issue: Fluoridation of Drinking WaterLead Department: Public WorksGeneral Plan Element or Sub-Element: 3.1A, 3.1D**1. What are the key elements of the issue? What precipitated it?**

On the November 7, 2000 election, the voters accepted fluoridated water if the City's potable water providers: Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) and San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), fluoridated the water they made available to the City. The specific ballot question to the voters was: *Shall the City of Sunnyvale accept fluoridated water from its water suppliers in compliance with State law requiring the fluoridation of public water systems, so long as the capital and associated costs of fluoridation are not passed on to the local ratepayers and/or taxpayers?* The voters' response was affirmative.

The ballot issue was initiated because the SFPUC was going to replace its existing fluoridation station on the San Francisco Peninsula with a new system-wide fluoridation facility at its water treatment plant in the East Bay. This will happen in May of 2005. Since the SCVWD has no plans at the moment to fluoridate its water and we do not fluoridate our well water, this will leave some parts of the City receiving fluoridated water and other parts receiving non-fluoridated water. Also, if one of the suppliers had a problem that would force the City to provide all its residents with water from the other supplier and from wells, we would have residents receiving fluoridated water that would normally not get it, and vice versa. Residents might not be pleased with this.

If the City decided to fluoridate all water it provides to its residents, it would have to do so with funds that are not passed on to the local ratepayers and/or taxpayers, according to the ballot measure approved by voters. Money will be made available by the State to cities and other providers to fluoridate their water. The City of Sunnyvale is number 82 on that list at this time. Until this money is available, Sunnyvale is not required to fluoridate its water.

This Study Issue would allow the study of the impacts of SFPUC fluoridation on the City of Sunnyvale. It would determine: 1) which residents are currently served

by SFPUC, SCVWD and the City; 2) how much it would cost to fluoridate all City and SCVWD water; and 3) the issues and costs associated with not fluoridating City and SCVWD water.

**2. How does this relate to the General Plan or existing City Policy?**

General Plan Elements 3.1A and 3.1D mandate that the Public Works Department ensure that potable water is available in sufficient quantity and pressure to meet the City's existing and future demands, and to ensure that potable water meets all quality and health standards. In order for the department to achieve these goals, there may be times when water from one provider must be replaced by the other's. Having water provided to one area of the City be different from that provided to others will create some inequity.

**3. Origin of issue:**

**Council Member(s):** \_\_\_\_\_

**General Plan:** \_\_\_\_\_

**City Staff:** \_\_\_\_\_

**X**

**Board or Commission (identify name of the advisory body from the list below):** \_\_\_\_\_

(Arts, Building of Code Appeals, BPAC, Child Care, Heritage, Housing and Human Services, Library, Parks and Recreation, Personnel and Planning)

**Board or Commission ranked this study issue \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_**

**Board or Commission ranking comments:**

**4. Multiple Year Project? Yes\_\_\_ No X Expected Year Completed 2005**

5. Estimated work hours for completion of the study issue (use 5 or 8-hour increments):

(a) Estimated work hours from the lead department	80
(b) Estimated work hours from consultant(s) if applicable:	200
(c) Estimated work hours from the City Attorney's Office:	40
(d) Estimated work hours from Finance:	10
(e) Estimated work hours from other department(s):	
Department: Human Resources (Risk & Ins.)	20
Department:	
Department:	

Total Estimated Hours: \_\_\_\_\_

6. Expected participation involved in the study issue process?

(a) Does Council need to approve a work plan? Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

(b) Does this issue require review by a Board/Commission? If so, please list below: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X

(c) Is a Council Study Session anticipated? Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

(d) What is the public participation process?

Public input on this issue via a public hearing. Some outreach will be necessary to inform the residents on what is happening and the changes in store for them.

7. Cost of Study: Please mark appropriate item below.

\_\_\_\_ Costs covered in operating budget – Water Supply and Distribution

\_\_\_\_ Costs covered by project - <project name>

X Budget modification needed for study - \$30,000.00

Explain below what the additional funding will be used for:

Funding would be used to pay a consultant to study the issue and issue a report indicating legal and technical requirements, and to cover staff time.

8. Potential fiscal impact to implement recommendations in the Study approved by Council, if any:

Mark a range for the items below:	\$500 or none	\$50K or less	\$51K - \$100K	\$101K - \$500K	\$501K or more
Capital expenditure range				X	
Operating expenditure range			X		
New revenues/savings range					

**Explain impact briefly:**

Implementing the project would involve installing injection pumps at the 2 Santa Clara Valley Water District turnouts including housing, the pumps themselves with all appurtenances, and electronic communication controls. It might be also necessary to do the same thing for City-owned wells. Once implemented, the added facilities would increase the number of personnel hours necessary for maintenance and upkeep, as well as the program's budget for parts and chemicals.

**9. Staff Recommendation for this calendar year:**

**"For" Study X Explain:** This will be mandatory in the near future when funding becomes available. A study of this issue will provide Council with facts about the extent of the fluoridation to be implemented within the next year, what a model city-wide implementation might be, what the costs would be, and some of the considerations of waiting for state funding versus making an immediate commitment in fluoridating all City water.

**"Against" Study     Explain.** If staff suggests that this study should not be considered again in the future or deferred at this time, please include this in your explanation:

**No Recommendation**

*Note: If staff's recommendation is "for study" or "against study", the Director should note the relative importance of this Study to other major projects that the department is currently working on or that are soon to begin, and the impact on existing services/priorities.*

Reviewed by

Marzi A. Rao  
Department Director

11/5/04  
Date

Approved by

Amy Chan  
City Manager

11/9/04  
Date